Dear Mike,

Until I received your 7/26 I had a mild curiosity about why you initiated and persisted in this correspondence. There seemed to be no real point, except for your effort to make your unreal theorizing appear to be real, to make untruth appear to be truth and fact out of fabricated fictions.

You theoreticians are alike in being over your depths, not recognizing this or the great harm you have done. You are driven to persist in your assorted disinformations, to enlarge upon what you persist in distorting and when what is not enough to make you look good to yourselves and to hide your immaturity and incompetence from yourselves, you make up what you want to be, convince yourselves of it and in doing this justify yourselves and your wild notion. In the course of all of this you don't care a bit about the additional harm you do or how vicious you become.

More gently than you deserve I tried to caution you over your proximity to a thin and sometimes invisible line you have already crossed with Braden, who has you where you really belong, in court over libel. You accomplished that by unquestioning quotation of a book that to one who knows nothing about the subject matter but has some slight knowledge of the realities of life should have been easily recognizable as at best dubious.

You ignore this and persist, and thinly disguised as questions become at once defamatory and menacing. I did not reach my years, live the life I've led and done what I have done and continue to do to be intimidated or frightened by a self-important nincompoop who is the walking and loud-talking embodiment of the countryman's phrase "college-educated ignoramus."

It is clear that you are trying to bait me into what you can imagine means other than it does and again tell others that it means other than it does. The obvious course is to ignore the bait and swim away. But before I do I want you to know a few things and strongly encourage that you resist your compulsion and not twist anything to conform to your crazy preconceptions and irrational fabrications.

I have not "been retained by Marcello to work in some way on his behalf, vis a vis the Kennedy

case." I have never seen or spoken to or been spoken to by Marcello or Wasserman and no such proposal was made by anyone or by any indifection.

However, if I were to make an ethical or moral evaluation of such an offer it would compare not unfavorably with your association with and work on a disinformational House committee which began with untenable preconceptions and never departed from them until a single last-minute kickback left it no real alternative with regard to it. I think it is impossible for any private person, regardless of his reputation, to do as much harm to the country as an irresponsible, dishonest official body and when this relates to what I regard as the most subversive of crimes in a country like ours I think that any such association, even one less than cooking up wild stories and pretending that alleged evidence makes them real, even less than fabricating what leads away from the realities of such a crime and such an "investigation," becomes its own subversion.

This is not to say that I have not rendered such services to others where you may not approve. I have been a (court arranged) consultant to the Department of Justice, as I have been to elements of the media, here and abroad, including regarding books.

During one of my exposures of the gross dishonesties of your committee George Lardner once exclaimed, "Why, you are defending the FBI!" Against some of the committee's recent abuses of the nation's trust I am willing to lay myself open to that charge again, and to a number of others. You are undoubtedly incapable of understanding that the defense of truth requires the exposure of falsehood - including even yours.

You are also probably incapable of understanding that while "defending" the FBI I had it in court in more cases than I can recall with certainty. Or that my best-paying consultancies of the past (I have none current) resulted in less untruth reaching mass audiences in at least three different major forms.

You and your "small potatoes" just "know you (meaning I) will want to respond to these allegations and see to it that you are not being used in a way you are unaware of."

The only "allegations" of which I know come from you. I believe I have said more than enough about them above - and I would caution you against any repetition of them or any other untruths about me.

On page 3 you say that I asked for certain information connecting Marcello and the 544 address. A more honest representation is that I accepted your offer of them. In backing out on your offer, beginning with a less than honest representation of it, you refer me to Marcello and/or Wasserman, thus also representing how little you doubt what you have so thinly disguised as questions.

This is baby stuff, befitting your own self-portrait but not befitting either manhood or confidence in the alleged evidence. If you dared subject it to critical examination you'd be throwing it at me.

You conclude by saying you are "Sorry to be the bearer of the bad news." You are not and you are not "the bearer of the bad news." You are the evil-minded and evil-intended inventor.

Just before that, childishly intending a threat while transparently pretending otherwise, you say what you call "these allegations inexorably raise some pretty ugly issues and appearances."

While hints and reminders do little good with you, I suggest that you consider that it is not only beauty that is in the eye of the beholder.

Pipsqueak in a man's shell, you have already entered on thin ground. While there is nothing about you or this or your other letters that leads me to believe you have or want any association with wisdom, I remind you of Santayana's, that he who refuses to learn from the past is doomed to relive it.

Sincerely,

Harold

Harold Weisberg

P.O. Box 218
St. Michaels, Maryland 21663

301-745-5229

July 26, 1979

Dear Harold:

Thank you for your most recent letter, which I received today. As per normal, while I disagree with much of what you say, I enjoyed your stern incantations.

I'd like to bring some information to your attention regarding some alleged "activity" of yours that I was recently informed of by two usually reliable sources. While both independently stated that the information was correct, I thought I'd write and ask you directly whether the "information" is true, false, or somewhere in between.

Essentially, I've been told that New Orleans Mafia leader Carlos Marcello has recently made representations (through his Washington attorney and representative) to major media outlets that you have been voluntarily enlisted to defend him against any charges that he was in any way involved in having President Kennedy murdered.

According to this information, Marcello's D.C. attorney, Jack Wasserman, has been informing reporters and editors that "the most respected Warren Commission critic, Harold Weisberg, has contacted us" to voice his firm belief in Marcello's "innocence" and the "total lack" of any evidence or information that would raise suspicion about his possible complicity. According to these reports, Wasserman has been "quoting" excerpts from a communication you allegedly provided to him on Carlos Marcello's behalf, and is representing you as "the best authority on Mr. Marcello's total non-involvement." One source stated that it was his impression - based upon what Wasserman has told editors - that you perhaps "had been retained" by Marcello to work in some way on his behalf, vis a vis the Kennedy case.

In any event, I thought I would bring these allegations to your immediate attention, in view of the potential significance of them.

I hope they are not true and that you would not be used - wittingly or unwittingly - for such purposes; particularly in this instance.

You have stated that you were disturbed over the circulation of information regarding your relative, Mafia associate Willie Weisberg, and his avowed wish to formulate a Kennedy assassination. You wrote that you thought this Weisberg-Weisberg "connection," however distant, might be used by your would-be

detractors to draw "suspicions" about your objectivity or committment in considering potential Mafia complicity in President Kennedy's murder. Need I comment that reports or allegations of your purported assistance or aid on behalf of Carlos Marcello and his attorney make suspicions about the Willie Weisberg "connection" seem like rather small potatoes.

I know you will want to respond to these allegations and see to it that you are not being used in a way you are unaware of, if that is the case. That Jack Wasserman has apparantly been saying these things about you to the news media is, I believe, true. The specifics - beyond what I've recounted here - are not clear. I hope you can clear this up.

You might guess that my general opinion of Jack Wasserman is not all that dissimiliar to my opinion of his client or boss. Investigators have long reported that Wasserman enjoys something beyond the Constitutionally prescribed lawyer/client relationship with Marcello, and there are reports that he is identified by some law enforcement bodies as a part of the actual Marcello organization. I will keep my estimation of him private, and would certainly note that he has never been convicted of a serious crime, as have other fellow Marcello attorneys (G. Wray Gill, second degree murder or manslaughter*; Cecil Burglass, tax fraud; David Levy, bribery**).

At the same time, I would also note that Finding 15 of the Third Interim Report of the Kefauver Senate Committee (1951) is at least worth keeping in mind when one considers Wasserman's legal work on behalf of Marcello and other reported clients such as Willie Weisberg's superior, Angelo Bruno:

> "15. A major question of legal ethics has arisen in that there are a number of lawyers in different parts of the country whose relations to organized criminal groups and individual mobsters pass the line of reasonable representation. Such lawyers become true "mouthpieces"

---

* Clarification of the specific crime committed has proven difficult to reconstruct, as Gill was relatively young at the time, and the official records of it were later mysteriously destroyed; reportedly by orders of the Marcello organization.

** One of the first such convictions under the Omnibus organized crime statutes; despite a colorful defense provided by Levy's attorney, Jim Garrison.

for the mob. In individual cases, they have become integral parts of the criminal conspiracy of their clients."

In any event, I look forward to hearing your side to these stories. I certainly know that erroneous allegations are a more than common occurrence in the Kennedy case.

In your letter you requested that I provide you with various areas of information or citations regarding the presence of Marcello employees or "associates" at the 544 Camp Street Building, as well as other information relating to David Ferrie's reported activities there, and the possible Oswald connection therein.

Needless to say, if you have in fact been enlisted in some way on Marcello's behalf, I certainly would not care to respond to your request for such public information, nor would I think such future contact is appropriate; regardless of your longtime status as a respected Warren Commission critic.

Likewise, if these allegations about you are essentially accurate, I think I would prefer not to forward copies of the HSCA reports to you; preferring to let Wasserman and his client absorb the cost of furnishing you such material, if they or you desire.

In any event, as you can see, these allegations inexorably raise some pretty ugly issues and appearances. I look forward to hearing your response, and hope you know how much I would share your contempt for Marcello and his representatives if they have caused this information to circulate about you erroneously. Of that much, at least, they are entirely capable.

Sorry to be the bearer of bad news,

Best wishes,

Mike Ewing

Mike Ewing